

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MISSOURI
EASTERN DIVISION**

MICHAEL D. BLEDSOE,

Plaintiff,

v.

MISSOURI DEPARTMENT OF
CORRECTIONS, et al.,

Defendants.

)
)
)
)
)
)
)
)
)
)
)

No. 4:21-cv-00010-JCH

MEMORANDUM AND ORDER

This matter is before the Court on defendants Steven Pfister, Erin Gould, and Christine Dicus's motion to strike plaintiff's response to the answer. Plaintiff has not responded to the motion, and the time for doing so has passed. For the following reasons, the motion will be granted.

The Federal Rules of Civil Procedure define pleadings as a complaint, an answer to a complaint, an answer to a counterclaim designated as a counterclaim, an answer to a crossclaim, a third-party complaint, an answer to a third-party complaint, and if the court orders one, a reply to an answer. Fed. R. Civ. P. 7(a). Federal Rule 7(a) does not allow for a reply to an answer unless ordered by the Court. *Id.* Here, the Court did not order plaintiff to file a reply to defendants' answer. For this reason, the Court will strike from the record plaintiff's response to defendants' answer, which plaintiff captioned as his "motion in opposition and memorandum of law to defendants' answer to plaintiff's complaint" (Doc. 48). *See, e.g., Davis v. ALS Express Trucking, Inc.*, No. 4:20-cv-1672-RLW, 2021 WL 1534556, *2 (E.D. Mo. Apr. 19, 2021) (striking plaintiff's answer to defendant's affirmative defenses as in violation of Federal Rule 7(a)).

Accordingly,

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that defendants Steven Pfister, Erin Gould, and Christine Dicus’s motion to strike plaintiff’s response to defendants’ answer is **GRANTED**. [ECF No. 49]

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the Clerk shall **STRIKE** from the record plaintiff’s “motion in opposition and memorandum of law to defendants’ answer to plaintiff’s complaint.” [ECF No. 48]

Dated this 27th day of January, 2022.

_____\s\ Jean C. Hamilton_____
JEAN C. HAMILTON
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE